DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 492 CG 006 623

AUTHOR Biggers, Julian L.

TITLE The Effect of School System Size and Position in the Administrative Hierarchy upon the Guidance Administrator's Perceived Level of Authority and Needs Satisfaction.

INSTITUTION Texas Tech Univ., Lubbock.

SPONS AGENCY Texas

PUB DATE 71

NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; *Guidance Functions; *Guidance Personnel; Guidance Programs; *Need Gratification; Personnel Needs; Power Structure; *Role Perception; School Size

ABSTRACT

Guidance administrators in 70 school systems were surveyed concerning their perceived level of authority in 24 areas of the guidance program and their perceived needs satisfaction on a Maslow-type scale. School system size and the respondent's position in the administrative hierarchy were used as independent variables to test effects upon authority level and needs satisfaction. Guidance administrators near the top of the school organization generally perceived them themselves having higher levels of authority than those further removed. Position in the administrative hierarchy had little influence upon the needs satisfaction of the incumbent. Guidance administrators in systems under 50,000 enrollment were significantly more varied in their perceptions of their level of authority and needs satisfaction than administrators in larger districts. Based upon the findings reported and the limitations of the sample, it was generally concluded that the organizational factors of system size and position in the administration influence the perceptions of the guidance administrator. (Author)

ED054492

THE EFFECT OF SCHOOL SYSTEM SIZE AND POSITION IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE HIERARCY UPON THE GUIDANCE ADMINISTRATOR'S PERCEIVED LEVEL OF AUTHORITY AND NEEDS SATISFACTION

Julian L. Biggers

Professor of Education

Texas Tech University

1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEH REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

This study was supported by a grant from State Appropriated Research funds, College of Education, Account Number 191-5221

CG 006 623

THE EFFECT OF SCHOOL SYSTEM SIZE AND POSITION IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE HIERARCY UPON THE GUIDANCE ADMINISTRATOR'S PERCEIVED LEVEL OF AUTHORITY AND NEEDS SATISFACTION

Julian L. Biggers

Texas Tech University

The need to clarify the guidance administrator's role exists, yet, as with other leadership positions in education, systematic investigation is virtually non-existent. The guidance administrator as the potential leader of the school's guidance program needs to have his role in the school's administrative hierarchy defined and strengthened where necessary in order to maximize the program's contribution to the students. Role theory suggests that the expectations of the individual as well as the expectations of others are vital in defining the position.

The role has been studied in terms of functions actually performed or functions that should be performed as viewed by the guidance administrator (Biggers and Mangusso, 1972; Feldman, 1951; MacDonnel, 1956; Rosecrance, 1960). Donigian and Wellington (1971) reported counselors' perceptions of desirable and undesirable behaviors in their directors of guidance as a function of their effectiveness as leaders. The dearth of studies suggests that this is an area ripe for investigation.

Administrative theory as a field of study is in its infancy. Specific applications to the guidance program, thus, are limited in scope. Kehas (1965), Calia (1965), Brown (1967), and Humes (1970) have provided a start in urging consideration of various facets of administrative theory as a mode to improve guidance leadership. Needless to say, administrative theory and role theory can play an important function in studying and understanding the guidance administrator in the schools. One factor that joins the two areas is the impact of the organization upon its members. Many variables within an organization influence the perception of different individuals with respect to their own and others' roles. Identification of the influence of selected organization characteristics upon role perception can, thus, assist in interpretation of the role.

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of two aspects of the school organization upon the perceptions of the guidance administrator. The organizational variables selected from the many possible were school system size and the administrator's position in the school's administrative hierarchy. The basic consideration in selecting these two aspects of organization was ease in defining. System size can readily be identified by the total number of students enrolled, while position in the administration can be defined as a function of the chain of command.

In addition to limiting the independent variables to two, it was also deemed practical in an exploratory study to limit the dependent variables. The perceptions of the guidance administrator to be studied were restricted to his view of his level of authority in the overall administration of the system's guidance program, and his satisfaction with the role. Specifically, the study was directed toward seeking answers to the following question: What influence, if any, does system size and the guidance administrator's position in the administrative hierarchy have upon his perception of (a) his role functions, (b) his level of authority, and (c) his needs satisfaction?

Procedure

The guidance administrator was defined for the purposes of the study as an individual having system-wide authority for the guidance program. A sample of 120 individuals was compiled using respondents to an earlier study by the author (Biggers and Mangusso, 1972) plus "Directors of Guidance" from the APGA membership list. A questionnaire, cover letter, and stamped-addressed envelop was mailed to the sample. A return of 70 usable and 15 unusable responses was received. The unusable responses were either incomplete or the respondent did not have system-wide administrative responsibilities.

The questionnaire designed for the study sought information in four areas. Part One elicited information related to the independent variables of school system size and an ordered

listing of the system's administrative chain of command from the Superintendent to the respondent. Part Two required the respondent to estimate the percentage of time spent in the role functions of Executive, Administrator, and Manager. The definitions used to describe the three functions were based upon the work of Kowitz and Kowitz (1968). Part Three consisted of 24 statements related to the operation of the school's guidance program. The respondent rated each item on a 7-point scale indicating his perceived level of authority, low to high, in the overall administration of the system's guidance program. The final portion of the questionnaire contained 13 statements in a Maslow-type perceived needs satisfaction scale. The guidance administrator rated the degree of satisfaction derived from his job in each area using a 7-point scale.

Information from the questionnaire was punched in machine data cards preparatory to carrying out statistical computations using an IBM 360. The independent variables of system size and position in the administrative hierarchy were arbitrarily dichotomized in preparation for t tests of means of the dependent variable data from Sections Two, Three, and Four of the questionnaire. The sample was divided into responses from those guidance administrators in systems with less than fifty-thousand students enrolled and those from larger systems. The "Small" group had 43 members while the "Large" group contained 27 respondents. The guidance

administrator's position in the administration was determined by his distance from the superintendent of schools as a linear function of the chain of command. The superintendent's level was designated as 1, the next administrative level below as 2, and so on. The sample was divided into the "Near" group and the "Far" group. The "Near" group, N = 29, consisted of guidance administrators at the second and third levels of the chain of command, while the "Far" group, N = 41, was positioned at the fourth level or further removed from the top.

Results

Size of system. The respondents with usable replies represented 70 school systems in 27 states. The schools had a total enrollment of over 4.9 million students. The smallest system had three-thousand enrolled and the largest had over a million students in attendance. The school systems employed a total of 1,492 elementary school counselors and 4,826 secondary school counselors.

The perceptions of the guidance administrators in the "Small" and "Large" districts regarding the role elements of executive, administrative, and managerial are shown in Table 1. The variance in the "Small" group's views of the executive and administrative functions was greater than the "Large" group's yielding F tests significant at the 0.05 level. Apparently, size of the system had little influence upon the general division of the guidance administrator's role as perceived by members of the two groups. The guidance admini-

strator seems to view his role as being about equally divided between the three functional elements.

Viewing their respective levels of authority, the two groups of guidance administrators were similar with respect to the general level of agreement of means for the 24 organizational statements as shown in Table 2. It should be noted that the "Small" school group had a higher mean rating for 21 of the 24 items. However, the "Small" group was significantly more variable in 10 of the 24 areas while the "Large" group was more variable in its perceptions of the level of authority on two items.

The needs of the guidance administrators in the "Large" and "Small" school groups were about equally satisfied when the mean ratings were compared. On the other hand, as shown in Table 3, members of the "Small" group were significantly more varied in their degree of satisfaction resulting in significant F ratios for 11 of the 13 needs areas. The respondents from the "Large" systems were significantly more varied on only one item.

Position in the administration. The influence of the guidance administrator's position in the administrative hierarchy upon his perception of the role elements of executive, administrator, and manager is shown in Table 1. The administrators comprising the "Near" group (levels 2 and 3) tended to emphasize the executive element at the expense of the administrative facet, while the "Far" group had the opposite view of

the role elements. Both had about the same perception of the managerial factor as an element of their job role.

The overall pattern of mean responses by the two groups to the 24 level of authority statements was quite similar as shown in Table 4. The "Near" group, however, did rate their authority as being significantly higher in responding to five areas. The "Far" group, on the other hand, was significantly more varied in viewing their level of authority in three areas.

The level of reported needs satisfaction for the two groups of guidance administrators was almost identical as shown in Table 5. Each group was significantly varied in reporting perceived satisfaction in one of the thirteen areas.

Discussion

Based upon the findings reported and the limitations of the sample, it may be generally concluded that organizational factors influence the perceptions of the guidance administrator. The relationship between school system size and the guidance administrator's position in the administrative hierarchy still needs clarification. The correlation coefficient between these two variables for the sample was 0.363 ($p > .01$). While the correlation is significant, its practical application only suggests that as system size increases, the guidance administrator's position tends to move further down in the chain of command. The impact of the relative status of the guidance administrator upon the effectiveness of the guidance

program has yet to be explored; however, the findings from this study might suggest some interesting hypotheses. Future studies need to incorporate a measure of the organization's complexity, such as span of control, in addition to the linear chain of command approach, to fully understand the relationship of position in the administration with other outcomes.

The immediate import of the findings indicate that the guidance administrator's position in the administration influenced his perception of his level of authority but had little or no affect upon his perceived needs satisfaction. When size of the system was considered, a different picture emerged. The system's size had some bearing upon the level of authority perceived to be exercised, but produced significantly varied results in needs satisfaction among guidance administrators in systems with under fifty-thousand enrollment. The position of the guidance administrator in smaller systems appears to be, in general, less uniformly defined with respect to status, authority, and resulting needs satisfaction than for administrators in larger systems.

An examination of the relative levels of perceived authority reported for the 24 items revealed some interesting results. The lowest levels of authority were assigned to those statements dealing directly with the school counselor, while the highest ratings were generally assigned to areas dealing with planning, programming, and public relations. The result was not surprising in light of previous

studies which reported that most guidance administrators had a staff relationship with school counselors (Biggers and Mangusso, 1972; Feldman, 1951). Feldman (1951) reported that 45 percent of the guidance administrators in her sample favored a consultative relationship with counselors. It has been suggested (Brown, 1967; Humes, 1970) that the guidance administrator must begin to assume a line-authority relationship with the school counselor as a first step toward guidance program improvement and resolution of the counselor's role definition. The attitudes of the participants in the present study toward line-staff relationships was not obtained. The findings suggest that most of the sample viewed their direct authority over counselors as being relatively low which suggests a consultative-staff relationship. In response to an open-ended question to elicit recommendations for strengthening the guidance administrator's level of authority in general, seventeen (24 percent) of the respondents stated that placing counselors under their direct authority instead of the building principal would be a major improvement. On the other hand, one respondent suggested keeping his position in a staff relationship to counselors, but placing the principals under the line authority of his superior. Resolution of the guidance administrator-counselor relationship begins to appear to be a central issue in defining the roles of both professionals.

Lastly, the guidance administrator's view of the role

elements comprising their job needs consideration. Regardless of system size or position in the administration, the respondents perceived their role as being made-up of almost equal parts executive, administrative, and managerial functions. This finding has implications for the training of future administrators and for the selection of persons for the position. As noted by Brown (1967), we must redirect current programs to better prepare the guidance administrator for the reality of the position. Needless to say, the successful movement from counselor to guidance administrator would require aptitude in all three areas. Kowitz and Kowitz (1968) pointed out in their discussion of the three role functions that a good manager might make a poor administrator, a good administrator make a poor executive, and so forth. It becomes readily apparent that not just any counselor can become a competent guidance administrator. The fact must be acknowledged by school administrators because anything less than a competent person for the top guidance position could be disastrous for guidance program development and the students it serves.

REFERENCES

Biggers, J. L., and Mangusso, D. J. The work of the guidance administrator. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1972, 11, in press.

Brown, D. Trends in educational administration: impact upon guidance administrator. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 6, 191-196.

Calia, V. F. Organization theory and research: some implications for guidance programs. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 43, 757-763.

Donigian, J., and Wellington, A. M. Leadership behavior of guidance directors related to counselors expectations. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 10, 146-152.

Feldman, Estelle E. Problems of the city director of guidance. Occupations, 1951, 29, 264-266.

Humes, C. W. Solution to school counselor role: administrative change. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1970, 10, 87-90.

Kehas, C. D. Administrative structure and guidance theory. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1965, 4, 147-153.

Kowitz, G. T., and Kowitz, Norma G. Operating guidance services for the modern school. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1968.

MacDonnell, J. F. City-wide directors of guidance. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1956, 35, 161-163.

Rosecrance, F. C., and Hayden, V. D. School guidance and personnel services. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1960.

TABLE 1

Influence of School System Size and Position in Administrative Hierarchy Upon Guidance Administrator's Perception of Three Role Elements

(In percentages)

Grouping	Role Elements		
	Executive	Administrative	Managerial
System Size			
"Large"	29.6	37.9	31.7
"Small"	26.4	37.5	35.5
Position in Administration			
"Near"	30.5	35.7	33.8
"Far"	25.6	39.0	34.2

TABLE 2

Influence of School System Size Upon Perceived Level of Authority

Level of Authority to:	School Size Group "Small" Sch. (N = 43)		"Large" Sch. (N = 27)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	t
Determine the nature and scope of the guidance program	5.67	1.51	5.67	1.49	05	
Project or determine future needs of the guidance program	5.81	1.14	5.92	1.07	05	
Formulate objectives for the guidance program	5.86	1.30	5.78	1.31		
Prepare plans and programs to follow in reaching guidance objectives	5.81	1.21	5.78	1.01	05	
Make major decisions regarding the guidance program	5.21	1.32	5.04	1.34		
Prepare the guidance budget for the system	4.86	2.20	4.22	2.58		
Provide facilities for operation of the guidance program	3.93	1.78	3.29	1.88		
Establish system-wide rules or regulations governing operation of the guidance program	4.95	1.56	4.44	1.89		

Table 2--Influence of School System Size Cont.

Level of Authority to:	School Size Group "Small" Sch. (N = 43)		"Large" Sch. (N = 27)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	t
Take final action on matters of guidance policy	4.39	1.91	4.22	1.89	05	
Determine personnel needs for the guidance program	4.88	1.68	4.89	1.93		
Identify and appoint counselors to work in the guidance program	4.26	1.93	4.78	2.15		
Recommend changes in parts of the guidance program	5.84	1.21	5.74	1.16	05	
Establish inservice programs for counselors	6.19	1.12	6.44	0.80	05	
Determine the functions of the counselors	4.91	1.38	4.33	1.77	05	
Improve the counselor-student ratio	3.84	2.07	4.11	1.95	05	
Assign counselors for special duties	4.30	2.17	3.67	1.94	05	
Evaluate counselors for promotion or a raise	3.63	1.98	2.70	2.14		
Assign counselors to campuses	4.25	1.99	4.22	2.01		
Balance the workload of counselors	3.60	2.00	2.74	1.74	05	

Table 2--Influence of School System Size Cont.

Level of Authority to:	School Size Group "Small" Sch. (N = 43)		"Large" Sch. (N = 27)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	t
Disseminate information about the guidance program	6.28	0.91	6.18	0.92		
Revise outmoded parts of the guidance program	5.81	1.22	4.89	1.69	01	
Involve guidance in curriculum development	4.56	1.64	4.11	1.85		
Take corrective action when a counselor makes a mistake	4.67	1.78	3.29	1.68	05	
Assess or evaluate progress in the guidance program	5.86	1.14	5.37	1.36		

TABLE 3

Means and SD's for Needs Areas When School System Size is the Independent Variable

Maslow Need Category	Needs Areas	Size Grouping "Large" $\bar{X}$	"Large" SD	"Small" $\bar{X}$	"Small" SD	F
Security	1. Feeling of security	5.6	1.3	5.4	1.8	05
Social	2. Help other people	6.0	0.9	6.1	1.0	05
	3. Develop relationships	5.6	1.3	5.9	0.9	01
Esteem	4. Feeling of self-esteem	5.4	1.1	5.4	1.3	05
	5. Feeling of peer prestige	5.2	1.1	4.7	1.5	05
	6. Feeling of community prestige	5.2	1.2	4.7	1.7	05
Autonomy	7. Professional authority	4.5	1.1	4.6	1.6	05
	8. Thought and action	5.6	1.0	5.1	1.6	05
	9. Setting guidance goals	4.9	1.2	4.9	1.6	05
	10. Guidance methods	5.4	1.0	5.7	1.3	05
Self-Actualization	11. Professional growth	5.8	1.3	5.8	1.4	05
	12. Feeling of self-fulfillment	5.6	1.3	5.5	1.4	05
	13. Feeling of accomplishment	5.4	1.4	5.5	1.2	NS
		N = 27		N = 43		

TABLE 4

Influence of Position in Administrative Hierarchy
Upon Perceived Level of Authority

Level of Authority to:	Administrative Position "Near" Group (N = 29)		"Far" Group (N = 41)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	t
Determine the nature and scope of the guidance program	5.89	1.26	5.51	1.63		
Project or determine future needs of the guidance program	5.96	1.02	5.78	1.17		
Formulate objectives for the guidance program	5.72	1.44	5.90	1.20		
Prepare plans and programs to follow in reaching guidance objectives	5.79	1.11	5.80	1.67		
Make major decisions regarding the guidance program	5.38	1.05	4.98	1.47	05	
Prepare the guidance budget for the system	4.83	2.28	4.46	2.42		
Provide facilities for operation of the guidance program	4.17	1.98	3.34	1.67		
Establish system-wide rules or regulations governing operation of the guidance program	5.34	1.37	4.34	1.80		05

Table 4--Influence of Position in Hierarchy Cont.

Level of Authority to:	Administrative Position "Near" Group (N = 29)		"Far" Group (N = 41)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	t
Take final action on matters of guidance policy	4.76	1.74	4.02	1.96		
Determine personnel needs for the guidance program	5.41	1.45	4.51	1.88		05
Identify and appoint counselors to work in the guidance program	4.86	1.57	4.17	2.26	05	
Recommend changes in parts of the guidance program	6.07	0.88	5.61	1.34	01	
Establish inservice programs for counselors	6.28	0.84	6.29	1.12		
Determine the functions of the counselors	4.93	1.58	4.51	1.53		
Improve the counselor-student ratio	4.58	1.96	3.49	1.95		05
Assign counselors for special duties	4.17	2.04	3.98	2.15		
Evaluate counselors for promotion or a raise	3.86	2.08	2.85	1.99		05
Assign counselors to campuses	4.62	1.72	3.98	2.13		
Balance the workload of counselors	3.79	2.01	2.90	1.83		

Table 4--Influence of Position in Hierarchy Cont.

Level of Authority to:	Administrative Position "Near" Group (N = 29)		"Far" Group (N = 41)			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F	t
Disseminate information about the guidance program	6.07	0.92	6.36	0.89		
Revise outmoded parts of the guidance program	5.62	1.37	5.34	1.56		
Involve guidance in curriculum development	4.69	1.65	4.17	1.76		
Take corrective action when a counselor makes a mistake	4.76	1.82	3.71	1.78		05
Assess or evaluate progress in the guidance program	5.62	1.32	5.71	1.21		

TABLE 5

Means and SD's for Needs Areas When Position in Administrative Hierarchy is the Independent Variable

Maslow Need Category	Needs Areas	Grouping "Near" $\bar{X}$	"Near" SD	"Far" $\bar{X}$	"Far" SD	F
Security	1. Feeling of security	5.5	1.5	5.4	1.7	
Social	2. Help other people	6.0	1.1	6.1	0.9	
	3. Develop relationships	5.6	1.2	5.9	1.0	
Esteem	4. Feeling of self-esteem	5.4	1.0	5.4	1.4	05
	5. Feeling of peer prestige	4.9	1.4	4.9	1.4	
	6. Feeling of community prestige	4.7	1.4	5.0	1.6	
Autonomy	7. Professional authority	4.6	1.2	4.6	1.6	
	8. Thought and action	5.5	1.3	5.1	1.4	
	9. Setting guidance goals	5.1	1.4	4.8	1.4	
	10. Guidance methods	5.6	1.3	5.5	1.1	
Self-Actualization	11. Professional growth	5.5	1.6	6.1	1.0	01
	12. Feeling of self-fulfillment	5.3	1.4	5.7	1.3	
	13. Feeling of accomplishment	5.5	1.3	5.5	1.3	
		N = 29		N = 41		

APPENDIX A

THE GUIDANCE ADMINISTRATOR

Name_____Title_____

Years in present position____Percent time devoted to guidance program____

Name of school system_____Total enrollment_____

Number of counselors (Full-time equivalents): Elementary____Secondary____

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

Identify the administrative "chain of command" in the system from the Superintendent of schools to you. Just list the title of each position in the chain, in order. Do not give the individual's name. Your title should be the last on the list.

Title	No. individuals at this general level*
Superintendent	*1*
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

**Give the total number of persons with the general title at each level, i.e., Supt. - 1, Asst. Supt. - 3, etc.*

Number of professional assistants assigned to your office_____

Number of clerical staff assigned to your office_____

LINE-STAFF RELATIONSHIPS. Check your basic administrative relationship with each of the following school personnel.

	Line	Staff	N/A
Your office	_____	_____	_____
Secondary counselors	_____	_____	_____
Elementary counselors	_____	_____	_____
Secondary principals	_____	_____	_____
Elementary principals	_____	_____	_____
School psychologist	_____	_____	_____
School social worker	_____	_____	_____
Attendance officer	_____	_____	_____
School nurse	_____	_____	_____
Curriculum supervisor	_____	_____	_____

Is there a formal system-wide committee or advisory board for the guidance program?_____If yes, who appoints the members?_____

Do the campuses have separate guidance committees?_____If yes, who appoints the members?_____

ADMINISTRATIVE ROLE

The guidance administrator's position might contain a hierarchy of role elements. Kowitz and Kowitz* have proposed the roles as executive, administrative, and managerial. For the purpose of this item, the following definitions are used:

Executive Role . . . Policy-making level. Develop policies and guidelines for the system's guidance program, project future directions, identify needs, etc.

Administrative . . . Planning-programming level. Prepare plans to impliment decisions made at the executive level, design activities and roles to fit plans, assign responsibilities, and so forth.

Managerial . . . . . Implimentation-supervision level. Put plans into action, supervise workers, take care of details, order materials, and so forth.

Now, classify your position as you perceive it with regard to these three role elements. Since your total workload equals 100 percent, the roles would consume lessor percentages of the total.

Executive		Administrative		Managerial	
_____	+	_____	+	_____	= 100%

*Kowitz & Kowitz. *Operating guidance services for the modern school*. 1968.

. . . . . .

ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY

Estimate your office's level (degree) of authority or responsibility in the overall administration of the system's guidance program on the following items. The level of authority may range from "High" to "Low".

Example

Level of authority to:	Low						High
Direct the work of your office staff	:	:	:	:	:	:	X :
Develop class schedules for students	X :	:	:	:	:	:	:

. . . . . .

Level of Authority to:

	Low						High
1. Determine the nature and scope of the guidance program	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
2. Project or determine future needs of the guidance program	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
3. Formulate objectives for the guidance program	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
4. Prepare plans and programs to follow in reaching guidance objectives	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

Level of Authority to:	Low							High
5. Make major decisions regarding the guidance program	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
6. Prepare the guidance budget for the system	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
7. Provide facilities for operation of the guidance program	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
8. Establish system-wide rules or regulations governing operation of the guidance program	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
9. Take final action on matters of guidance policy	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
10. Determine personnel needs for the guidance program	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
11. Identify and appoint counselors to work in the guidance program	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
12. Recommend changes in parts of the guidance program	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
13. Establish inservice programs for counselors	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
14. Determine the functions of the counselors	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
15. Improve the counselor-student ratio	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
16. Assign counselors for special duties	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
17. Evaluate counselors for promotion or a raise	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
18. Assign counselors to campuses	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
19. Balance the workload of counselors	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
20. Disseminate information about the guidance program	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
21. Revise outmoded parts of the guidance program	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
22. Involve guidance in curriculum development	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
23. Take corrective action when a counselor makes a mistake	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
24. Assess or evaluate progress in the guidance program	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

Do you feel that your office needs more authority to properly direct the guidance program?_____If yes, what change(s) in the school system would be of the most benefit to obtaining the needed authority:_ _____

_____

_____

JOB SATISFACTION

Below you will find thirteen statements concerning your position. Following each statement, you will find a scale ranging from "None" to "Very much". Please read each statement and mark an "X" on the scale according to the way you perceive or see your position giving you satisfaction in each area.

. . . . . .

Area	None							Very much
1. The feeling of security in my position	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
2. The opportunity to give help to others	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
3. The opportunity to develop close relationships with fellow workers	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
4. The feeling of self-esteem I get from being in my position	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
5. The feeling of prestige my peers have for my position	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
6. The prestige of my position held by people in the community	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
7. The professional authority connected with my position	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
8. The opportunity for independent thought and action in my position	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
9. The opportunity for participation in setting school goals	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
10. The opportunity for participation in the determination of guidance methods	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
11. The opportunity for professional growth and development in my position	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
12. The feeling of self-fulfillment I get from my position	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
13. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment in my position	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

___ I would like a synopsis of this study. Please send it to:

_____

_____

_____ Zip_____

APPENDIX B

Factor Analysis of Data for Total Sample

The responses by the 70 guidance administrators were subjected to a factor analysis with a varimax rotation using an IBM 360. The analysis yielded five factors that accounted for over 90 percent of the common variance in the sample as shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Factor	% Total Variance	Cumulative Variance*
1	64.34	64.34
2	17.07	81.42
3	5.14	86.56
4	2.77	89.33
5	2.26	91.58

*Slight variations due to rounding

Table 7 presents a summary of the factor patterns of variables with rotated loadings greater than .30.

TABLE 7

Loading	Factor 1 - General Administration
72	Make major decisions regarding the guidance program
71	Establish system-wide rules and regulations governing operation of the guidance program
70	Executive Role (in percent)
70	Project and determine future needs of guidance program

Table 7--Cont.

Loading	Factor 1 - General Administration
69	Determine nature and scope of the guidance program
64	Take final action on matters of guidance policy
56	Formulate objectives for the guidance program
53	Revise outmoded parts of the guidance program
53	Involve guidance in curriculum development
53	Recommend changes in parts of the guidance program
51	Determine functions of the counselors
48	Improve the counselor/student ratio
-47	Managers Role (in percent)
46	Prepare plans and program to follow in reaching objectives
45	Determine personnel needs for the guidance program
40	Evaluate counselors for promotion or a raise
38	Provide facilities for operation of the guidance program
36	Satisfaction of "Professional Authority" need
33	Satisfaction of "Opportunity to help others" need
33	Satisfaction of "Opportunity to participate in determination of guidance methods" need
31	Satisfaction of "Opportunity for independent thought and action" need

Loading	Factor 2 - School System Size
96	Number of secondary school counselors
96	Total Enrollment
90	Number of elementary school counselors
88	Total number of counselors

Table 7--Cont.

Loading	Factor 2 - School System Size
64	System size classification
45	Number of clerical assistants available to guidance administrator
35	Number of professional assistants available
-33	Take corrective action when counselor makes a mistake
30	Administrative hierarchy classification

Loading	Factor 3 - Esteem Satisfaction
81	Satisfaction of "Prestige from peers" need
81	Satisfaction of "Prestige from others" need
68	Satisfaction of "Self-esteem from position" need
57	Satisfaction of "Professional authority" need
-38	Establish inservice programs for counselors
35	Satisfaction of "Feeling of security" need
32	Take final action on matters of guidance policy

Loading	Factor 4 - Un-named
-87	Administrative Role (in percent)
67	Managerial Role (in percent)
-35	Disseminate information about the guidance program
30	Determine nature and scope of the guidance program

Loading	Factor 5 - Counselor Contact
-77	Identify and appoint counselors to work in program
-75	Assign counselors to campuses
-56	Take corrective action when counselor makes mistake

Table 7--Cont.

Loading	Factor 5 - Counselor Contact
-51	Assign counselors for special duties
-46	Evaluate counselors for promotion or a raise
32	Administrative hierarchy classification
-30	Prepare the guidance budget for the system